

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 1999/08/05 : CIA-RDP80-04826R000400040084-6

~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~

29 December 1951

CAREER SERVICE COMMITTEE

Working Group on EMPLOYEE RATING

Minutes of 11th Meeting, 28 December 1951, 10:00 A.M.

Present:

25X1A9a

1. Minutes of the 10th Meeting of 19 December 1951, were presented and approved as submitted.

2. The name for the form presented in draft by [REDACTED] "PERSONNEL EVALUATION REPORT" was accepted by the Group as the name to be used on the final form. This action closed out Item 3 of the Agenda for the meeting.

25X1A9a

3. The proposed PERSONNEL EVALUATION REPORT was discussed in detail, corrections made and agreed upon. [REDACTED] will present a new draft at the next meeting incorporating all corrections made.

25X1A9a

*PERSONNEL* 4. The Group next turned to the first business of the Agenda-- consideration of Item 13 of the draft of the ~~"PERSONNEL POTENTIAL EVALUATION REPORT"~~ originally presented by [REDACTED]. Motion was presented to discard Item 13 in its entirety. This motion was based on the opinion that the form as corrected was effective and filled the requirements laid on this group in its original directive. For the proposed report does include (a) an estimate by the supervisor of the employee potential; (b) recommendation for future assignment; (c) a statement by the employee of his preference for future assignment. Therefore, the EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT can be integrated into a Career Service program and is uniform in approach. Objections to the inclusion of Item 13 in the new form were *discussed as follows;*

25X1A9a

a. Item 13 consists of a series of abstract personal qualities rated on a scale which is subject to variable interpretations by people of variable natures. ~~Therefore, to all intents and purposes, a rating scale has been established which is subject to positive numerical coding, although the expression of the employee by the supervisor is an indefinite expression of opinion,~~

*could*  
b. This variable form of rating ~~can~~ sabotage all prior written constructive evaluation of the employee since the supervisor might find

25X1A9a

DOC 105	REV DATE 22 JUN 1951	B
ORIG COMP	OPI 32	TYPE 26
ORIG CLASS 5	PAGES 2	REV CLASS
JUST 22	NEXT REV 2011	AUTH: HS 10-2

~~SECRET~~ CIA-RDP80-01826R000400040084-6

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 1999/09/01 : CIA-RDP80-01826R000400040084-6

~~SECRET~~

~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~

Career Service Committee  
Page two

29 December 1951

*of comparison with other individuals*

that discussion with the employee on a ~~comparative~~ basis is more open to objections by the employee with resulting limitations on frank discussion. Where comparisons are not, the basis of discussion is more constructive and objective.

e. This type rating was discarded by the Civil Service Commission as unsatisfactory. *Reasons for this action are in reports published by the Civil Service Commission concerning the background of Public Law 873.*

Thus Item 13 was felt to be a psychological hazard to open discussion and objective evaluation of the employee. The motion was put to vote at 3:45 P.M. and accepted.

25X1A9a [redacted] cast a dissenting vote and requested that it be entered in the minutes that in his mind Item 13 should be included as an integral part of the form but that certain minor changes of evaluation factors should be made and complete definitions of what was meant by the factors should be part of the instructions.

5. The next meeting was set for 10:00 A.M., 2 January 1952.

6. This meeting of the Working Group convened at 10:00 A.M. and adjourned at 4:30 P.M. with a thirty minute recess for lunch.

[redacted]  
Chairman

25X1A9a

Approved For Release 1999/09/01 : CIA-RDP80-01826R000400040084-6

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~